

Mack	Platts	Sherman
Maloney	Polis	Shimkus
Manzulio	Pompeo	Shuster
Marchant	Posey	Simpson
Marino	Price (GA)	Smith (NJ)
Markey	Price (NC)	Smith (TX)
Matheson	Quayle	Smith (WA)
McCarthy (CA)	Quigley	Southerland
McCarthy (NY)	Rehberg	Speier
McCaul	Reyes	Stearns
McClintock	Ribble	Stivers
McCollum	Richardson	Stutzman
McCotter	Rigell	Sullivan
McHenry	Rivera	Sutton
McIntyre	Robby	Thompson (PA)
McKeon	Roe (TN)	Thornberry
McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Tiberi
Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Tonko
McNerney	Rogers (MI)	Towns
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Tsongas
Meeks	Rokita	Turner
Mica	Rooney	Upton
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Van Hollen
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Velázquez
Miller (NC)	Ross (AR)	Walberg
Miller, Gary	Ross (FL)	Walsh (IL)
Miller, George	Rothman (NJ)	Walz (MN)
Moran	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Mulvaney	Royce	Schultz
Murphy (CT)	Runyan	Waters
Murphy (PA)	Ruppersberger	Watt
Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Waxman
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Webster
Neugebauer	Scalise	Weiner
Noem	Schiff	Welch
Nugent	Schilling	West
Nunes	Schmidt	Westmoreland
Nunnelee	Schock	Wilson (FL)
Olson	Schrader	Wilson (SC)
Owens	Schwartz	Wittman
Palazzo	Schweikert	Wolf
Pascarell	Scott (SC)	Womack
Paul	Scott (VA)	Woodall
Paulsen	Scott, Austin	Woolsey
Payne	Scott, David	Yarmuth
Petri	Sensenbrenner	Yoder
Pingree (ME)	Serrano	Young (FL)
Pitts	Sessions	Young (IN)

NOES—91

Altmire	Gutierrez	Pelosi
Andrews	Hanna	Perlmutter
Bachmann	Hastings (FL)	Peters
Baldwin	Heck	Peterson
Bass (CA)	Heller	Poe (TX)
Bishop (NY)	Hinchey	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Holt	Rangel
Burgess	Hoyer	Reed
Butterfield	Inslee	Renacci
Capuano	Israel	Richmond
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Rush
Clarke (MI)	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Clay	Kucinich	T.
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Sewell
Costa	LoBiondo	Shuler
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Sires
DeFazio	Lynch	Slaughter
Dent	Matsui	Stark
Deutch	McDermott	Terry
Dicks	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Donnelly (IN)	McKinley	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Moore	Tierney
Farr	Nadler	Tipton
Filner	Neal	Visclosky
Fitzpatrick	Oliver	Walden
Fudge	Pallone	Wu
Gardner	Pastor (AZ)	Young (AK)
Garrett	Pearce	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—14

Boustany	Graves (MO)	Pence
Dold	Honda	Reichert
Giffords	Hurt	Smith (NE)
Gingrey (GA)	Lummis	Whitfield
Gohmert	Michaud	

□ 1435

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 9, 2011, I missed rollcall votes Nos. 165, 166, and 167 to attend to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 165, "yea" on rollcall No. 166 and "yea" on rollcall No. 167.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. HINCHEY, New York
Mrs. MALONEY, New York
Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
Mr. CUMMINGS, Maryland

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN MEMBERS TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH REMAINDER OF 112TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 9, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JERRY LEWIS, the Honorable MAC THORNBERRY, the Honorable FRED UPTON, the Honorable ANDY HARRIS, and the Honorable FRANK R. WOLF to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through the remainder of the One Hundred Twelfth Congress.

JOHN BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

PROTECTING AND DEFENDING THE RULE OF LAW IN DOMA

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, what happened to the rule of law?

Last week, the U.S. Justice Department announced that President Obama would stop defending the Defense of Marriage Act. I remind you that the President took an oath to protect and defend the Constitution.

The Defense of Marriage Act became law in September 1996 to solidify traditional marriage within Federal law. The President now abandons the defense of this law, claiming that no reasonable argument can be made to demonstrate that the law is constitutional—a position many legal scholars have ridiculed while pointing to a wealth of legal authority, including to relevant Federal case law.

So it appears that, not only is the President substituting his power and judgment for that of the Congress when it comes to a number of bold adminis-

trative measures to write law from the Oval Office, but he is now substituting his power and judgment for that of the Supreme Court. It appears to me that President Obama sees no need for the other two branches of the Federal Government.

PRESIDENT OBAMA ENFORCES THE LAW ON DOMA

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. I hadn't planned to speak except I must rebut the nonsense we just heard from the previous speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has a duty to faithfully execute the laws. He is doing so. Though he doesn't agree with the Defense of Marriage Act and though he doesn't think it's constitutional, unlike President Bush, who refused to implement and to enforce the laws he thought were unconstitutional, President Obama is enforcing the law. He is simply not urging it in court. That's his prerogative, and that's his duty if he doesn't think it's constitutional.

The fact of the matter is, given Supreme Court precedent on the standards to use in defending a law that discriminates against people, he had no choice because, when you have a group that is discriminated against and that inherently in its characteristics is not politically powerful enough to protect itself, the precedents all say you must have heightened scrutiny.

That is what the President is urging in court. He is enforcing the law, and he is doing exactly what he ought to do.

SOMBER ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL GUARD PLANE CRASH

(Mr. RIGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the anniversary of the single largest loss of members of the National Guard since World War II.

Ten years ago last week, the Virginia Beach community and, really, the entire country suffered a tremendous loss when 21 National Guard members perished when their helicopter crashed in southern Georgia during a rainstorm. Eighteen of those members were from Camp Pendleton's Red Horse Guard Unit in Virginia Beach, and it included my good friend Paul Cramer.

My constituent Elayne Schmuckler reached out to our office to share her brother's story. Richard's honorable legacy lives on today, as does the legacy of every guardsman who perished on that flight.

My thoughts and prayers are with the families today on this somber anniversary. The selfless service of their

loved ones and their service to our country will not be forgotten.

May God bless them and comfort them.

□ 1440

END THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Today, a bipartisan coalition of Members of Congress have introduced a privileged resolution calling for a vote in this Congress to end the war in Afghanistan. More than 60 percent of the American people want us out of there. This war is already approaching the cost of a half trillion dollars. We have Americans who are losing their jobs; their wages are being knocked down. We have Americans losing their homes, losing their retirement security. They can't send their kids to the colleges they want, and we're spending all this money on a war that is a waste of time, money, blood, and treasure to try to prop up a corrupt regime in Afghanistan. Our occupation over there is fueled in insurgency.

It's time for Congress to take its constitutional responsibilities under Article I, section 8. We haven't really done that with respect to Afghanistan. It's time for us to do that. Let's have an up-or-down vote. That's what this resolution is about.

I urge all Members of Congress to consider supporting the privileged resolution that ends the war in Afghanistan.

THE BUDGET BATTLE

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, what is the budget battle about? It is about our country; it is about our kids; and it is about our freedom.

Imagine if you were borrowing 40 cents for every \$1 that you spent in your household. You would change your purchasing habits. That's what this battle is about.

Do we want to leave to our children a legacy of billions and billions of dollars in debt which they owe to China? That's what this budget battle is about. This is very important stuff.

We have to put the politics of spending and positioning and about being Democrats and Republicans aside. We've got to do what's best for the next generation, not the next election. We need to come together and come up with commonsense solutions, because you and I as Americans, we can do better and we deserve to give our children better than what we're doing right now.

WHAT ABOUT JOBS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUELSKAMP). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, today we want to talk about jobs. The people in my district, the 10th Congressional District of California, in Concord, Antioch, Pittsburg, Fairfield, Livermore, they want jobs. They want to go to work. They want this government to create jobs.

We are now in the 10th week of the new majority, the Republican majority, and thus far there has not been one significant, useful job bill brought to the floor. Instead, we had a CR brought to the floor that, in all probability, will cost America 700,000 jobs. That's what the CR, the first piece of legislation introduced by the Republicans, would do, 700,000 jobs. And it's all across the board: construction jobs, research, manufacturing jobs, education.

We just heard one fellow stand up here on the floor and say he was worried about his children. He should be, because the bill that he voted for less than 10 days ago will destroy thousands and thousands of teaching jobs across this Nation, including 218,000 young children that will not be in the Head Start program. We can't afford that kind of a "jobs" program.

Joining me today is BETTY SUTTON from the great State of Ohio, in the heart of the once very strong manufacturing base of this Nation.

Ms. SUTTON, if you would tell us what's going on in Ohio and how you see these issues.

Ms. SUTTON. Well, I thank the gentleman, and I thank you for your leadership.

Boy, that poster says a lot: GOP continuing resolution destroys 700,000-plus jobs, possibly yours. And where did we get that number? Before we get to Ohio, where did we get that number? We got that number from a number of places. Ben Bernanke said that the plan would cost hundreds of thousands of jobs. The GOP's CR, according to Goldman Sachs, would reduce economic growth by 2 percent and cause the unemployment rate to increase. And a study by the International Monetary Fund concluded that the idea that fiscal austerity stimulates economic activity in the short term finds little support in the data.

We have a group of 300 economists, including two Nobel laureates, who wrote a letter warning that the short-sighted budget cuts to "human capital, our infrastructure, and the next generation of scientific and technological advances" would threaten future economic competitiveness as well as our current recovery.

So that's where we begin. Despite all of this forewarning about what this path will lead us to, we still see a continuing resolution that indicates we're going to lose 700,000-plus jobs.

In the State of Ohio, I'm sure that a number of people, most of the people

out there, have seen at the statehouse where we're witnessing democracy in action, at least from the outside, because for a while there the statehouse doors were closed when all of the workers and fair-minded Ohioans descended upon our State's capitol to protest against what the Republican Governor there is trying to do to public sector workers.

Under the guise of taking care of our deficit, an attack on workers' rights is being waged not only in Ohio but across this country, from Wisconsin to Ohio to the floor of Congress where we've seen attack after attack. And it's really a sad thing, because we all know we should be focused—and the other side should join us in focusing—on priority one, which is putting people back to work.

In Ohio, the key to our budget problems is more people working than you have revenue to pay for the public services and the public sector employees who help to make our world turn. Can you imagine the idea?

It was not the workers in Wisconsin or Ohio or across this country that drove our economy off the cliff. It was not those teachers or those firefighters who rush into those burning buildings when we run out of them. It was not the police officers who are out there on our streets protecting us and keeping our communities safe. It was not the workers.

The workers are not the problem. They are part of the solution of where we need to go. But the bottom line is we need to be focused on creating jobs. And it's just amazing that not only are our friends across the aisle, the Republicans, not interested and focusing on that—10 weeks on the job, zero jobs—they're actually looking at cutting those people who do have jobs, their rights. It's just fundamentally unfair and it's counterproductive.

We all know that we need to trim back our budget. We should always be willing to trim back the budget, but only by engaging in smart cuts, not just indiscriminate cuts.

What happens when a person doesn't have a job? What happens when 700,000 people don't have a job? Do we think they just disappear, that they are no cost to our government, to our country? Not to mention the loss of dignity and the loss of opportunity, everything that our country stands for, having a chance to make a way for your family, to feed your family and take care of your family.

□ 1450

It's a crazy idea to say that we can make cuts that cut hundreds of thousands of jobs and somehow that will lead us to prosperity.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And reduce the budget deficit.

Our President in his State of the Union said that we have to out-educate, out-research, out-manufacture and out-build the rest of the world. Yet the first significant piece of legislation